

amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—

(1) PERCENTAGE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2006, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(2) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount increased under paragraph (1), if not a whole dollar amount, shall be rounded to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

#### SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in section 2(b), as increased under that section, not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2007.

#### SEC. 4. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 1311 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating the second subsection (e) (as added by section 301(a) of the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-454; 118 Stat. 3610)) as subsection (f).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2562) the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2006, and move for its immediate consideration in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the annual cost-of-living adjustment, S. 2562, as amended, is one of the more important bills the Congress considers each year since it was first provided in 1976. Briefly, S. 2562, as amended, would authorize a cost-of-living adjustment—COLA—to VA's disability compensation effective December 1, 2006, as well as publication of the rates.

The Congressional Budget Office currently projects the COLA will be 2.2 percent. However, it may be higher or lower depending on changes in the Consumer Price Index. The exact percentage will be calculated in the next few weeks and the COLA will go into effect on December 1, 2006.

The cost of providing a COLA is assumed in the Administration's budget baseline. Likewise, H.R. 5385, the Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2007, fully funds this year's veterans COLA.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ranking Member LANE EVANS for all his hard work and cooperation this Congress in his advocacy for veterans on this and other legislation. It has been truly a pleasure to work with him as Ranking Member this Congress. I do not think he ever forgot the core values shared by his family, and taught by his parents where he grew up. These same core values were polished by the United States Marine Corps. He embraced them and they were enduring and they helped guide him here in his service to country. Mr. EVANS will be missed on this Committee and in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members will support this bill and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on S. 2562, as amended.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2562, as amended, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2006. The House passed a similar measure, H.R. 4843, on July 26, 2006 by a vote of 408-0.

Each year since 1976, Congress has provided a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to the benefits provided to our Nation's disabled veterans and their survivors.

The purpose of the annual COLA is to ensure that Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) cash benefits retain their purchasing power and are not eroded by inflation.

The House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees are following their longstanding practice of setting the COLA by reference to the yet-to-be-determined Social Security increase.

In February 2006, the Administration projected a 2.6 percent increase; as of May 2006, the Congressional Budget Office is projecting the COLA to be 2.2 percent. However, it may be higher or lower depending on changes in the Consumer Price Index. The exact percentage will be calculated in the next few weeks and the COLA will go into effect on December 1, 2006.

As Chairman BUYER indicated, this is one of the more important pieces of legislation the Veterans' Committee brings to the floor each year, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman BUYER, Ranking Member EVANS, and our Subcommittee Chairman MILLER, as well as Senator CRAIG and Senator AKAKA on the Senate side, for moving forward on this bill. Passage of this legislation will assure most of the men and women currently receiving benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) receive a well-deserved increase in benefits as of January 1, 2007.

We should never allow the compensation received by veterans, disabled in service to the Nation to erode in value as the cost of living rises. S. 2562, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2006, will help our service-disabled veterans and their survivors maintain the purchasing power of their benefits in 2007 by providing for an increase in benefits.

This bill will help most, but not all, VA beneficiaries maintain the value of their benefits. Once again, I am disappointed that the bill does not include funding to allow our widows, widowers and their children to receive a cost-of-living adjustment for their supplemental transitional benefits as provided in the House passed bill. As a result, the value of the \$250 transitional benefit paid to surviving spouses with minor children for their first 2 years of eligibility will erode in value in 2006.

Mr. Speaker, if we can find millions to maintain the tax cuts provided to our wealthiest citizens, surely we can find an additional five or ten dollars a month to maintain the transitional benefit paid to our surviving spouses with children at its current purchasing power. Our Gold Star Wives, husbands whose wives have perished in our current conflict and their children deserve better.

No amount of money can adequately compensate our veterans for the loss of their health, or families for the loss of a loved one. It is important that the benefits, which our Nation provides to partially compensate for such losses, do not lose their value over time.

In 2005, over 29,000 veterans in Nevada received disability compensation or pension payments from VA and thousands of Nevada family members and survivors receive VA cash benefits.

The action we are taking here today will help the Nevada veterans and families who depend on these VA benefits.

I understand the urgency of passing this COLA so that veterans and their dependents will receive a timely increase in VA benefits. I hope that before this Congress recesses for the year, the increase in DIC benefits and other provisions passed by the House and Senate can be enacted into law. Those who have served this Nation, deserve no less.

S. 2562 will receive my full support and it deserves the support of all Members of this House.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NORTH KOREA NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 2006

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3728) to promote nuclear nonproliferation in North Korea, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. KUCINICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill will not bring relief to the millions of North Koreans who are suffering every day. It is estimated that 2 million people have died of starvation in North Korea. More than 13 million North Koreans suffer from malnutrition, including 60 percent of all children, the worst rate among 110 developing nations surveyed by the World Health Organization and UNICEF. North Korea had an infant mortality rate of 2 percent in 2000. South Korea's infant mortality rate for the same year by contrast was 0.5 percent. There are chronic shortages of food and fuel already. Heavy military spending, estimated at between one-quarter and one-third of gross domestic product, has constrained and skewed economic development. North Korea has a per capita GDP of \$1,000. South Korea's per capita GDP by contrast is \$18,000.

Despite significant inflows of international assistance over the past decade, harsh economic and political conditions have caused tens of thousands of persons to flee the country.

The better approach the U.S. should be supporting is the approach adhered to by the South Koreans. They have taken the approach of unification as a way to pull North Korea into the modern world. It worked for East Germany,

and it can work for North Korea again. The downside of this approach is that missile defense advocates will have to create another false reason to spend in excess of \$9 billion a year on the failed system. I am confident they can conjure up some new enemy and protect defense industry profits.

Now, it is true, Mr. Speaker, that North Korea has declared that it possesses nuclear weapons, this according to a report by Dr. Hans Blix that was presented and remarked on in a congressional subcommittee the other day. He said this report says it has not provided evidence of this claim. It has violated the NPT and twice declared its withdrawal from the treaty.

It operates a nuclear fuel cycle consisting of a 5-megawatt research reactor, which uses natural uranium; a reprocessing facility which produces plutonium; and various uranium processing and fuel fabrication facilities. The United States has claimed that the country also has an enrichment capability.

In 2005 Pakistan's President Musharaff stated that the A.Q. Khan network had provided centrifuge machines and designs to North Korea, although the scale of its enrichment capability remains unknown. North Korea has not signed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Now, under a section called "What Must be Done" in the report that Dr. Blix delivered, the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission makes many specific and detailed recommendations. The most important of them are summarized as, number one, to agree on general principles of action; number two, to reduce the danger of present arsenals, no use by states, no access by terrorists; number three, to prevent proliferation, no new weapons systems, no new possessors; number four, work towards outlawing all weapons of mass destruction once and for all, including preventing an arms race in space by prohibiting any stationing or use of weapons in outer space. I would recommend this to the reading by Members of this Congress who are concerned about nuclear proliferation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is time that this Congress calls for the abolition of all nuclear weapons. That, in effect, is what the Nonproliferation Treaty is all about. It is true that the use of nuclear weapons threatens the future of mass public, cities, nations, civilization itself, and, indeed, all of life on Earth. Nuclear weapons in the arsenal of any country undermine the security of all countries, including the United States. Under the Treaty of Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the NPT, all nuclear weapon states are committed to good-faith negotiations to achieve nuclear disarmament.

On June 6, 2006, the Chair and Vice Chair of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, commonly known as the 9/11 Commission, cited as their number one concern for the security of the United

States the availability of nuclear weapons materials for attack upon the American people. The 2006 report of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission concludes: "So long as any state has nuclear weapons, others will want to use them. So long as any weapons remain, there is a risk that they will one day be used by design or accident. Any such use will be catastrophic. The model nuclear weapons convention circulated by the United Nations demonstrates the feasibility of achieving the global elimination of nuclear weapons."

So, Mr. Speaker, I am once again asking this House to call for the abolition of all nuclear weapons and to ask that the House call upon the President to initiate multilateral negotiations for the abolition of nuclear weapons. We can start by opening up direct negotiations with North Korea for the purpose of getting their participation, and I think that is a much better approach than the legislation that we are about to send over to the President.

And for that purpose, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the chairman what his reasoning is in moving this bill when he was so supportive of selling fissile materials to India, which, like North Korea, is not a signatory to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and, unlike North Korea, has a demonstrated nuclear capability.

Now, I was only a kid then, but I remember when we sold F-15s to Iran so that Iran could offset Soviet power in South Asia. And because we sold F-15s and other things to Iran, we wound up selling chemical weapon precursor materials to Iraq to offset Iran in the Middle East. Now we are told that we should sell fissile materials to India, which would free up Indian nuclear reactors to produce many more nuclear weapons for the Indian nuclear weapons program as an offset to Chinese power in Asia.

Mr. Chairman, if we do this with India, what it would do is encourage the Chinese to increase their nuclear arsenal, and I submit to you that we are one of the potential targets of that enhanced Chinese nuclear arsenal.

□ 0045

Even more worrisome is that this Indian nuclear build-up would accelerate further the Pakistani nuclear build-up, which my friend from Ohio referred to a moment ago.

And while I have strong confidence in the stability of the Indian government, and in the stability of Indian democracy, I have much less faith in the stability of the Pakistani government, and of Pakistani democracy, and of the Pakistani government's ability to keep under control those nuclear weapons which it already has, and more of

which it would be encouraged to build because of the sale of fissile material to India.

And in a military coup, if there is a military coup in Pakistan, which there has been multiple times in the last 20 years, we should be very, very concerned about the stability of not only south Asia, but of the world.

I think the chairman, as one of the subcommittee chairs of the International Relations Committee would surely agree with me that rather than sanctioning nonsignatory States, approving of nonsignatory States to those nonproliferation treaties, the better course of action is to respect these international agreements and to immediately bring to the Senate a total ban on nuclear testing, and comprehensive treaties concerning nuclear proliferation.

I would be happy to yield to the chairman for his response.

Mr. ROYCE. Yes. Let me explain to the gentleman that, first, our efforts with respect to India is to bring India into the nonproliferation regime.

Mr. WU. Reclaiming my time. Is not ultimately the big picture effect of permitting India to go forward with this basically blowing out of the water the entire treaty system with which we have tried to restrain nuclear nonproliferation in this world? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Aliberti supports, and the United Nations Security Council resolution supports actions by member States in response to North Korea pulling out of the nonproliferation agreement, to go forward and put these types of prohibitions on the transfer of technologies to North Korea that would allow it to develop these types of weapon systems.

North Korea is a proliferator, India is not.

Mr. WU. Reclaiming my time. Is the gentleman citing something from the United Nations? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROYCE. I am citing the United Nations Security Council resolution adopted on July 15, 2006.

Mr. WU. Reclaiming my time. Is this the Congress of the United States or are we abdicating responsibility to the United Nations?

Mr. ROYCE. I am pointing out that all member States, in response to the actions by North Korea to develop and to proliferate weapons of mass destruction such as long-range ballistic missiles and atomic weapons, have attempted to curtail the transfer of technologies to this State, since it has adopted a very aggressive posture and thus has become a direct threat to the United States and to our allies in northeast Asia.

Mr. WU. Reclaiming my time. It is a very short question, amenable to a "yes" or "no" answer. Is this not the United States Congress? Are we not abdicating responsibility under your comment to the United Nations rather than taking responsibility ourselves?

Mr. ROYCE. We are taking responsibility because North Korea is a direct threat to the United States.

Mr. WU. I mean taking responsibility for Indian nuclear weapons, which will be produced as a result of our sale of fissile materials to India.

Mr. ROYCE. Our attempt with respect to India is to bring India into the MPT regime and lead it to peaceful purposes of nuclear energy and away from producing weapons outside of an MPT regime.

Mr. WU. I thank the gentleman and yield to the question from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to say that the gentleman from Oregon's point is well taken. As someone who engaged in the debate over India, I am familiar with the concerns that he has raised. And there are concerns about the ability of the United States Congress, which is being asked to on one hand ascent to the proliferation of one group, and deny the proliferation of another, for this Congress to be in a position of trying to help this country have a consistent program of nuclear nonproliferation, which I know is exactly the point that the gentleman relates to.

In addition to that, the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission has said that North Korea ought to be given the same kinds of guarantees that is in the agreed framework of 1994 that they are not going to be attacked. This is the same thing that has been recommended that is done with Iran as well. So we do not need to get into these nuclear crises and say that people are threats if we engage them in talks that work towards nonproliferation.

This group made recommendations, Mr. WU, that I am sure you are familiar with. They said that a negotiation with North Korea should aim at a verifiable agreement, including as a principle element, North Korea's manifestation of its adherence to the MPT and accepting the 1997 additional protocol, as well as the revival and a legal confirmation of the commitments made in the 1992 joint declaration on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

And notably saying that neither North nor South Korea shall have nuclear weapons nor nuclear reprocessing and uranium enrichment facilities, and fuel cycle services should be assured through international agreements. The agreements should also cover biological and chemical weapons as well as the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, thus making the Korean Peninsula a zone free of weapons of mass destruction.

So what Mr. WU is asking about, and which I certainly support, is some consistency in policy. And it beings with Congress since we are being called upon, as Mr. WU stated, to either agree or disagree with these policies.

I want to thank the gentleman for raising that, because this is the appropriate time to raise that.

Mr. WU. Reclaiming my time. I thank the gentleman. I want to make

clear that I am certainly not defending the North Korea regime. But, I am calling into question the actions of this Congress and the strong advocacy of the chairman in favor of a proposed treaty with India which would have the result of starting a nuclear arms race or accelerating a nuclear arms race in south Asia and, just as importantly, which in the big picture blows out the whole treaty system for restraining the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROYCE. With respect to the strategy to bring India into the MPT, in our considered judgment, and the judgment of the majority of the Members of this House, it is a wiser policy to bring them into the tent, to get their cooperation and to focus on using nuclear energy to produce energy for peaceful purposes in India.

Now, with respect to North Korea, it remains a very real threat with over a million troops, possibly several nuclear weapons, and most importantly, the propensity to export these types of weapons. This is not something we have seen from India in the past.

But North Korea is an exporter of its missiles and of its technology. And for that very reason, the goal of this legislation is to put a prohibition on the transfer to North Korea of the types of technologies that could be used by North Korea in order to further develop its weapons systems. It is that simple.

It is the same with respect to Iran. It is the same with respect to Syria. Now, we are putting in place a provision stating that North Korea shall not have the ability to receive from the United States or any companies in the United States this type of technology. U.S. companies will not be able to be licensed to export this kind of technology. They will be sanctioned if they attempt it.

Mr. WU. I share with the gentleman the concerns about the export of nuclear weapons from North Korea. The point of my earlier comments is not about export from India, but because of our actions with respect to India, that we would be encouraging and accelerating the Pakistani nuclear program from which there is a real risk of exportation. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. This is a discussion that should have been happening a long time ago in this Congress. Because no one really talked that deeply about the implication of our decision granting India the ability to gain access to fissile materials, in terms of the potential dialectic of conflict which develops between the proliferator, Pakistan, and India gaining the fissile materials.

Mr. WU has raised the point that is really central to the discussion about how do we protect world peace. How do we stop some kind of a conflagration from breaking out on the subcontinent if we do not have a consistent policy?

I mean, we know as was pointed out in the WMDC report here, that in Feb-

ruary of 1999, India and Pakistan signed a memorandum of understanding on a variety of nuclear confidence building measures.

Both countries, however, this report says: "Are continuing their efforts to develop and produce nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles." So, Mr. WU is right on in raising this. And this is the exact time this has to be raised, even though it is almost one in the morning on Saturday. I yield.

Mr. WU. Reclaiming my time. I would be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. ROYCE. Yes. In response, I do not think the opposition is to this bill. But I understand the concept, and the argument relating to the nonproliferation regime as you have laid it out.

But I think we have an honest disagreement about the approach to India and whether or not that will strengthen the regime. And that is what is playing itself out in debate here.

From my standpoint, the proliferation issues have been between Pakistan and North Korea, whereas India has shown itself resistant to proliferation, and has shown a willingness to look at a way to be brought into the fold of the MPT. So I saw that earlier initiative to bring India within the framework agreement and with the MPT as a positive step forward.

And with respect to this legislation, basically what it does is to apply exactly the same system of forced compliance on companies that now exist with respect to Iran and Syria.

That is to say, that in terms of getting a licensing agreement or having the ability to ship technologies into North Korea that could be used for the purpose of eventually developing those weapon systems, that will be prohibited. That is the intent of the legislation. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WU. Reclaiming my time. Unlike the gentleman from Ohio, the dialectic of proliferation is way beyond me.

□ 0100

I do recognize a bad idea when I see one, and encouraging India by selling it nuclear fissile materials, which would ultimately result in the increase of Chinese nuclear weapons and Pakistani nuclear weapons, is surely that bad idea.

There are times when we are all in the minority at one time or another. There was 68 of us who voted against approving the treaty to sell nuclear fissile materials to India. On that vote, I would have been happy to have been a minority of one because I do believe that it would add fuel to the fire of nuclear proliferation in south Asia in that it basically does blow out of the water any hope we have of treaty constraints on the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

I want to make it clear in this RECORD and for history that the actions of this administration in nuclear proliferation or trying to contain nuclear proliferation have been patently

irresponsible. This administration has underfunded the Nunn-Lugar legislation which seeks to purchase fissile materials, which would be otherwise available to terrorists on the open market.

This administration has proposed a treaty with India that would sell India nuclear fissile materials that would result in a nuclear arms race between India and China and India and Pakistan, and Pakistan is not a stable country. There is great danger of the leakage of nuclear weapons from Pakistan. You heard earlier from another speaker about Pakistani aid to nuclear proliferation elsewhere in the world.

Let the record show that if or when a mushroom cloud ever erupts over an American city, it will be traced back to this unwise vote in the United States Congress and to a bone-headed policy of this administration with respect to treaty rights, to Nunn-Lugar and this sale of nuclear materials to India.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, if I could make just one last comment in support of what the gentleman is saying, I am sure many are familiar that in the Hindu religion Brahma, the Creator; and Vishnu, the Preserver; and Shiva, the Destroyer exist simultaneously and represent the multiplicity of God.

We here are called upon to determine which of the principles, Creator, Preserver or Destroyer, shall work through each of us. As the gentleman from Oregon says, if we continue to pursue nuclear proliferation as embodied in the nuclear agreement with India, we will be open to the principles of destruction. At this moment when world tensions are rising and violence is cycling higher, we need to take the direction of preserving the peace and creating a new opening through the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

Again, I want to thank my friend from Oregon for raising this point at this propitious moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to inquire as to whether or not the gentleman from Oregon is planning on withdrawing his reservation or not.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to yield to the chairman for any further comments he might have.

Mr. ROYCE. I am going to yield back, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's forbearance and the Speaker's forbearance.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 3728, the North Korea Non-Proliferation Act of 2006. This legislation would amend the Iran and Syria Nonproliferation Act to extend the provisions of the Act to North Korea. Enactment of this legislation would impose sanctions on persons who transfer such weapons and related goods and technology to and from North Korea. This legislation would authorize sanctions that are equivalent to those required under current law

for persons who are found to transfer such items to and from Iran and Syria. S. 3728 also calls on the international community to act in accordance with the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1695 (UNSCR 1695), which prevents member states from conducting missile and related transfers to or from North Korea in reaction to the tests. This bill is timely and important. It deserves steadfast support from this body.

North Korea's nuclear ambitions are destabilizing. Its recent missile tests on July 5, 2006, were conducted against the urging of the international community. Ultimately, this recent missile test was a failure. But that act, taken together with its previous tests and North Korea's intransigent behavior during international talks on this matter, is indicative of the recalcitrant nature of the North Korean regime. North Korea is in fact continuing to pursue its nuclear and ballistic missiles programs in spite of diplomatic efforts by the international community and in contradiction with North Korea's previous commitments. North Korea's pursuit of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles technology and capabilities is an emerging danger to the national security of the United States.

North Korea's recent missile test also disappointed the international community. On July 16, 2006, the United Nations Security Council adopted UNSCR 1695 in order to prevent United Nations member states from conducting missile and related technology transfers to North Korea in reaction to the tests. UNSCR 1695 also requires North Korea to suspend all activities related to its ballistic missile program and return to the negotiating table. Enactment of S. 3728 would strengthen U.S. laws, authorizing the U.S. government to investigate, sanction, and prevent proliferation efforts made by or on behalf of the North Korean regime by government or private entities.

But sanctions alone will not ultimately solve this problem. Robust and constant diplomatic pressure on the North Korean regime must continue to be applied by the United States in coordination with the United Nations and other countries. North Korea and its pursuit of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles is not only the United States' problem. I am encouraged by the fact that China, Japan, South Korea, and Russia remain desirous of a peaceful resolution to this problem. The Six Party Talks involving these countries and North Korea should continue.

More progress should be made toward constraining North Korea's ability to develop nuclear weapons and ballistic missile technology and capabilities while we continue diplomatic efforts to encourage that government to abandon its nuclear ambitions. S. 3728, the North Korea Non-Proliferation Act of 2006, will help to achieve those goals.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 3728, the North Korea Non-Proliferation Act of 2006.

Mr. Speaker, Americans around the nation celebrated the Fourth of July this year by watching fireworks, hosting backyard barbecues, and spending time with their families. The North Koreans chose to observe America's birthday in a far more threatening fashion: they test launched a series of missiles, one of which was potentially capable of hitting American soil with a nuclear payload.

Pyongyang's destabilizing actions not only angered Washington, but set off alarm bells in

Seoul, Tokyo, Beijing and Moscow, our partners in the Six Party Talks. The UN Security Council quickly adopted a resolution requiring all Member States to prevent overseas sales of North Korea missiles, and to stop transfers of any financial resources to North Korea related to its missile or WMD programs.

The legislation before the House today implements this groundbreaking Security Council Resolution. By adding North Korea to the Iran and Syria Nonproliferation Act, the United States will take concrete actions against foreign firms that engage in missile- and WMD-related trade with North Korea.

The Executive Branch will now be forced to review every six months all credible intelligence regarding commercial transfers to North Korea of items applicable for the development of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles.

On the basis of these reviews, the President must sanction foreign firms that engaged in such trade, or explain to Congress why he has not done so.

This is Congressional direction at its best. We must remember that the Iran and Syria Nonproliferation Act, which this amends, forced the Executive Branch to take actions against firms engaging in illicit trade with both Iran and Syria, actions that the President would otherwise not have taken. Dozens of firms have been sanctioned for such Iran- and Syria-related trade in the years since, focusing global attention on their activities and on their governments.

The regime of Kim Jong-Il poses as much of a threat to international security as Iran and Syria. Common sense requires us to undertake the same review and sanctions for Pyongyang's activities and their commercial co-conspirators as we do for Iran and Syria.

Mr. Speaker, the North Korean leadership was hoping to gain the world's attention with its July missile launches. Pyongyang succeeded. But rather than forcing the world to bring a new tray of goodies to North Korea, the tests unified the world in opposition to North Korea's destabilizing actions, and brought about a new round of UN-approved sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, with the right package of carrots and sticks, I remain optimistic that the U.S. and its Six Party allies can negotiate a comprehensive and verifiable deal with North Korea. I hope that by July 4th next year, we will have such an agreement in hand. Until then, we must bring our laws in line with the recent UN Security Council resolution, and act decisively to undermine North Korea's missile and WMD programs.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation, and am gratified that it has passed this House.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3728

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "North Korea Nonproliferation Act of 2006".

**SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.**

(a) In view of—

(1) North Korea's manifest determination to produce missiles, nuclear weapons, and other weapons of mass destruction and to proliferate missiles, in violation of international norms and expectations; and

(2) United Nations Security Council Resolution 1695, adopted on July 15, 2006, which requires all Member States, in accordance with their national legal authorities and consistent with international law, to exercise vigilance and prevent—

(A) missile and missile-related items, materials, goods, and technology from being transferred to North Korea's missile or weapons of mass destruction programs; and

(B) the procurement of missiles or missile-related items, materials, goods, and technology from North Korea, and the transfer of any financial resources in relation to North Korea's missile or weapons of mass destruction programs,

it should be the policy of the United States to impose sanctions on persons who transfer such weapons, and goods and technology related to such weapons, to and from North Korea in the same manner as persons who transfer such items to and from Iran and Syria currently are sanctioned under United States law.

**SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO IRAN AND SYRIA NON-PROLIFERATION ACT.**

(a) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 2 of the Iran and Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106-178; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “, **NORTH KOREA,**” after “**IRAN,**”; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Iran, or” and inserting “Iran.”; and

(ii) by inserting after “Syria” the following: “, or on or after January 1, 2006, transferred to or acquired from North Korea” after “Iran.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, North Korea,” after “Iran.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Such Act is further amended—

(1) in section 1, by inserting “, North Korea,” after “Iran.”;

(2) in section 5(a), by inserting “, North Korea,” after “Iran” both places it appears; and

(3) in section 6(b)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting “, **NORTH KOREA,**” after “**IRAN,**”; and

(B) by inserting “, North Korea,” after “Iran” each place it appears.

**SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.**

Congress urges all governments to comply promptly with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1695 and to impose measures on persons involved in such proliferation that are similar to those imposed by the United States Government pursuant to the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106-178; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as amended by this Act.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 3:30 p.m.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today from

3:30 p.m. and for the balance of the day on account of personal reasons.

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 1:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

**SENATE BILLS REFERRED**

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1131. An act to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land within the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1288. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements to protect natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1346. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of maritime sites in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1829. An act to repeal certain sections of the Act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1913. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease a portion of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center for use as a visitor center for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 4001. An Act to designate certain land in New England as wilderness for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation system and certain land as a National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources in addition to the Committee on Agriculture for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

**ENROLLED BILL SIGNED**

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5631. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, also reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 318. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating Castle Nugent Farms located on St. Croix, Virgin Islands, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 326. An act to amend the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, and for other purposes.

H.R. 562. An act to authorize the Government of Ukraine to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor the victims of the manmade famine that occurred in Ukraine in 1932-1933.

H.R. 1728. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating por-

tions of Ste. Genevieve County in the State of Missouri as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2107. An act to amend Public Law 104-329 to modify authorities for the use of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2720. An act to further the purposes of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 by directing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to carry out an assessment and demonstration program to control salt cedar and Russian olive, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3443. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution facilities to the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District.

H.R. 4841. An act to amend the Ojito Wilderness Act to make a technical correction. Examined and found truly enrolled September 29, 2006.

**SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED**

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 203. An act to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced, to establish certain National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3187. An act to designate the Post Office located at 5755 Post Road, East Greenwich, Rhode Island, as the “Richard L. Cevoli Post Office”.

S. 3613. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2951 New York Highway 43 in Averill Park, New York, as the “Major George Quamo Post Office Building”.

S. 3930. An act to authorize trial by military commission or violations of the law of war, and for other purposes.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 483, 109th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 483, 109th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Thursday, November 9, 2006.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 483, the House adjourned until Thursday, November 9, 2006, at 2 p.m.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9716. A letter from the Regulatory Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—United States Standards for Soybeans (RIN: 0580-AA90) received September 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9717. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Low Pathogenic Avian Influenza; Voluntary Control Program and Payment of